



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/784,116	02/14/2001	Garth F. Schmeling	10001605-1	3838

7590 01/11/2006
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

CHAI, LONGBIT

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2131

DATE MAILED: 01/11/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/784,116

Applicant(s)

SCHMELING ET AL.

Examiner

Longbit Chai

Art Unit

2131

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 December 2005.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 7-10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 22, 23, 27, 29, 30, 34 and 35 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5, 7-10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 22, 23, 27, 29, 30, 34 and 35 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 April 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Original application contained claims 1 – 35. Claims 6, 11, 14, 17, 19 – 21, 24 – 26, 28 and 31 – 33 have been previously canceled; no claim has been amended or added in an amendment filed on 12/20/2005. Presently, pending claims are 1 – 5, 7 – 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 22, 23, 27, 29, 30, 34, and 35.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to the subject matter of the instant claims have been fully considered but are not persuasive.

3. As per claim 1, Applicant asserts Schneider does disclose downloading an applet 2411 to a client; however, Schneider does not teach the claim limitation "the applet being operable to customize a display of the data by the client according to the access rights". Examiner notes Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but are not persuasive because the broadest and reasonable interpretations of claim limitations are made to meet the claim language and the claim limitation "the applet being operable to customize a display of the data by the client according to the access rights" is interpreted as the applet makes the display and generate a view specific to the customer based upon the user's resource access right in the following ways: Schneider teaches when applet making the display, if the resource has a hyperlink, the hyperlink is included in the list; if it is a resource for which the user presently does not have access, but to which the user may request access, the list includes the name and email address

of the administrator for the resource (Schneider: Column 27 Line 41 – 51). Therefore, Schneider does teach the applet being operable to customize a display of the data by the client according to the access rights and as such applicant's arguments are respectfully traversed. Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1 – 5, 7 – 10, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ginter (Patent Number: 6253193), in view of Schneider (Patent Number: 6105027).

As per claim 1 and 13, Ginter teaches a method for sharing a-desudata including the steps of:

receiving, from a user of a client, a request for data from a server (Ginter: Column 38 Line 41 – 55),

obtaining access rights for the user (Ginter: Column 6 Line 16 – 31, Column 149 Line 1 – 3 and Column 307 Line 23 – 30); and

downloading to the client the access rights the data (Ginter: Column 6 Line 16 – 31, Column 307 Line 23 – 30 and Figure 17 & 26A). However, Ginter does not teach downloading to the client an applet, the applet being operable to customize a display of the data by the client according to the access rights.

Schneider teaches downloading to the client an applet (Schneider: Column 27 Line 23 – 25), the applet being operable to customize a display of the data by the client according to the access rights (Schneider: Schneider: Column 27 Line 41 – 51, Column 5 Line 58 – 61 and Column 9 Line 63 – 65: Examiner notes the claim limitation “the applet being operable to customize a display of the data by the client according to the access rights” is interpreted as the applet makes the display and generate a view specific to the customer based upon the user’s resource access right).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Schneider within the system of Ginter because Schneider teaches providing a security enhanced method for control access right to data in a distributed environment by consolidating within multiple access filters (Schneider: see for example, Column 1 Line 28 – 30 and Column 5 Line 65 – Column 6 Line 22).

As per claim 2, Ginter as modified teaches verifying that the user has access rights for the data (Ginter: Column 6 Line 28 – 30).

As per claim 3, Ginter as modified teaches verifying includes the step of authenticating a digital signature (Ginter: Column 196 Line 50 – 53).

As per claim 4, Ginter as modified teaches the step of verifying includes the step of authenticating a private key (Ginter: Column 196 Line 50 – 53 and Column 22 Line 7 – 14).

As per claim 5, Ginter as modified teaches the step of verifying includes the step of authenticating a private key (Ginter: Column 196 Line 50 – 53 and Column 22 Line 7 – 14).

As per claim 7 and 16, Ginter as modified teaches allowing modification of the data according to the access rights (Column 9 Line 63 – 65; Ginter: Column 120 Line 63 – 67).

As per claim 8, Ginter as modified teaches tracking changes in said document (Ginter: Column 243 Line 17 – 21).

As per claim 9, Ginter as modified teaches tracking access of said document (Ginter: Column 243 Line 17 – 21).

As per claim 10, Ginter as modified teaches tracking submission of documents (Ginter: Column 267 Line 54).

As per claim 12, Ginter as modified teaches the applet causing the client to display a view of the data for the user, the view being customized according to the access rights (Schneider: Column 27 Line 23 – 25, Column 5 Line 58 – 61 and Column 9 Line 63 – 65).

As per claim 18, Ginter as modified teaches including means for verifying a user's identity before the agent causes the server to download the data to the client (Ginter: Column 96 Line 12 – 17).

As per claim 35, Ginter as modified teaches said access rights are stored in a database (Ginter: Column 148 Line 59 – Column 149 Line 3).

5. Claims 15 and 30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ginter (Patent Number: 6253193), in view of Schneider (Patent Number: 6105027), and in view of Barron (Publication Number: 2001/0042124).

As per claim 15 and 30, Ginter as modified teaches the agent is operable to encrypt the data and the access rights (Ginter: Column 14 Line 30 – 36; Schneider: Column 10 Line 33 – 37). However, Ginter as modified does not disclose expressly the applet is operable to decrypt the data and the access rights.

Barron teaches the applet is operable to decrypt the data and the access rights (Barron: Para [0024] Line 9 – 17; Ginter: Column 14 Line 30 – 36; Schneider).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Barron within the system of Ginter as modified because Barron teaches a virtually enhanced security for a web-based applet software system for access, delivery, storage and sharing of documents and files (Barron: see for example, Para [0022]).

6. Claims 22, 27, 29 and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ginter (Patent Number: 6253193), in view of Schneider (Patent Number: 6105027), and in view of Wang (Patent Number: 6937726).

As per claim 22, Ginter as modified teaches downloading the accesses rights and the data with a session key, wherein the access rights and the data have been encrypted with the session key (Ginter: Column 220 Line 1 – 10 and Column 67 Line 41 – 42). However, Ginter as modified does not disclose expressly the session key has been encrypted with a public key for the user.

Wang teaches the session key has been encrypted with a public key for the user (Wang: Column 22 Line 24 – 29).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Wang within the system of Ginter as modified because Wang teaches providing a enhanced cryptographic method to protect data files / documents by periodically refreshing a decryption key (Wang: see for example, Column 1 Line 11 – 13).

As per claim 27 and 34, Ginter as modified teaches means for random generating said session key (Wang: Column 22 Line 24 - 29).

As per claim 29, the claim limitations are met as the same reasons as that set forth in the paragraph above regarding to claim 22 with the exception of the feature the agent is operable to cause the server to download the encrypted session key to the client along with the applet, the encrypted access rights, and the encrypted data. However, Ginter as modified further teaches the agent is operable to cause the server to download the encrypted session key to the client along with the applet, the encrypted access rights, and the encrypted data (Schneider: Column 10 Line 30 - 33).

7. Claims 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ginter (Patent Number: 6253193), in view of Schneider (Patent Number: 6105027), and in view of Wang (Patent Number: 6937726), and in view of Barron (Publication Number: 2001 /0042124).

As per claim 23, claims 23 does not further teach over claims 22 as addressed above (i.e.) to decrypt the session key with a private key for the user and to decrypt the data and the access rights with the decrypted session key (Examiner notes the decryption techniques at the data receiving side is the counter part of the encryption techniques at the data transmitting side) with the exception of the applet is operable for

the decryption of the objects as addressed above. However, Barron further teaches the applet is operable for the decryption of the objects as addressed above (Barron- Para [0024] Line 9 - 17; Ginter- Column 14 Line 30 - 36; Schneider).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Barron within the system of Ginter as modified because Barron teaches a virtually enhanced security for a web-based applet software system for access, delivery, storage and sharing of documents and fi.____ (Barron- see for example, Para [0022]).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Longbit Chai whose telephone number is 571-272-3788. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 8:00am-4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ayaz R. Sheikh can be reached on 571-272-3795. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


LBC

Longbit Chai
Examiner
Art Unit 2131


Primary Examiner
AU2131
1/5/06